

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO DIVISION**

<b>LYDIA CHAVARRIA,</b>  <b>Plaintiff,</b>  <b>v.</b>  <b>DR. KILOLO KIJAKAZI, ACTING</b> <b>COMMISSIONER OF THE SOCIAL</b> <b>SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,</b>  <b>Defendant.</b>	§ § § § § § § § § § §	<b>CAUSE NO. EP-22-CV-407-KC-RFC</b>
--	---	--------------------------------------

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On this day, the Court considered the above-captioned case. Pursuant to Paragraph 2(c) of the Court’s May 1, 2012, Standing Order, this case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Robert F. Castaneda. On June 13, 2023, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), ECF No. 13, which recommended that the Court affirm the decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (“Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s application for disability insurance benefits. *Id.* at 1.

Parties have fourteen days from service of a Report and Recommendation of a United States Magistrate Judge to file written objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).<sup>1</sup> Over fourteen days have elapsed since all parties were served with the R&R, and no objections have been filed. *See* R&R 15–16.

When parties do not file written objections, courts apply a “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law” standard of review to a report and recommendation. *United*

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal district courts conduct de novo review of those portions of a report and recommendation to which a party has objected. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) (“A judge . . . shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report . . . to which objection is made . . .”).

*States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (“[T]he ‘clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law’ standard of review . . . is appropriate . . . where there has been no objection to the magistrate’s ruling.”); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276–77 (5th Cir. 1988) (“[A] party is not entitled to de novo review of a magistrate’s finding and recommendations if objections are not raised in writing by the aggrieved party . . . after being served with a copy of the magistrate’s report.”). After reviewing the R&R, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and finds that they are neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *See Wilson*, 864 F.2d at 1221.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R, ECF No. 13, in its entirety, and **ORDERS** that the Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

**SIGNED this 28th day of June, 2023.**



KATHLEEN CARDONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE